

REMARKS

By the above actions, a new claim 19 has been added and all of the previously presented claims have been left unchanged. On the basis of the following, reconsideration of this application is requested.

Claims 9-14 and 16-18 were rejected as being unpatentable over the combined teachings of the Thomas and Anderson patents, while claim 15 was rejected based upon these patents together with Official Notice of the fact that venting louvers extending across a roof are well known.

The Examiner's rejections are clearly improper since neither of the cited references show or suggest the claimed feature "wherein a bottom side of the air guide channel is formed by a first roof panel portion which extends from a rear end of the roof vehicle toward a front end of the roof, and wherein a top side of the air guide channel is formed by a second roof panel portion which extends from the front end of the roof toward the rear end of the roof." This structure is clearly shown in Fig. 1 where the overlapping area of the two roof portions 5a, 5b form the top and bottom, respectively, of guide channel 7 as described on page 4 of the present application at lines 5-8. This feature is not mentioned at all in the Examiner's rejection and is not present in either patent. Both Thomas and Anderson disclose units designed to sit on top of the vehicle roof and as a result have their own housing enclosure 30, 18, respectively, that is separate and external of the vehicle roof.

Accordingly, it is impossible for anyone of any skill in the art to arrive at the present invention from the Thomas and Anderson patents even if their structures or any combination thereof were made to extend across the entire width of the vehicle. As such, reconsideration and whether or not solar power modules were to be added based in the disclosure of the Howard patent.

However, should this feature not have been merely overlooked, but rather the Examiner is somehow taking an unintended interpretation of the above-quoted claim language in order to be able to contend that this feature is present in the Thomas patent, he is requested to contact the undersigned by telephone so that agreement can be reached as to wording that the Examiner will accept as meaning what applicants intend the above quoted language to mean.

On the basis of the foregoing, in the absence of Previously Presented and more relevant prior art being discovered, this application should now be in condition for allowance and action to that effect is requested. However, while it is believed that this application should now be in condition for allowance, in the event that any issues should remain, or any Previously Presented issues arise, after consideration of this response which could be addressed through discussions with the undersigned, then the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned by telephone for the purpose of resolving any such issue and thereby facilitating prompt approval of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David S. Safran
Registration No. 27,997

Customer No. 25570

Roberts Mlotkowski Safran & Cole, P.C
PO Box 10064
McLean, VA 22102

Direct Telephone: (703) 584-3273

DSS:kmm